

SUREWEST COMMUNICATIONS
Petition for Clarification and Partial Reconsideration of *TRO*
January 27, 2004

I. ILEC Service Area System Description/Overview

- a. Area Composition/ Customer Base
- b. Outside Plant Deployment Transition
 - i. ATM Based Intrasystem Fiber with Copper to Home
 - ii. Minimal FTTC
 - iii. Will serve customer mixed copper/fiber (Passive Optical Network) providing video, voice and high speed data (triple play) over DSL.
 - iv. Deployment to commence during February
 - v. Transition to FTTP (CAP X enormously costly)
 - vi. Cisco is our Primary Vendor

II. Out of Area System Deployment

- a. Sacramento Region – (Sacramento, Elk Grove, Lincoln)
- b. Present system is a hybrid coaxial/fiber FTTP network.
- c. Converting new and former customers to full FTTP network.
- d. Providing triple play.

III. Petition Issues

Problem: Many new developments mix residential and small/medium businesses into multi-unit premises. Ambiguities among text of *TRO*, footnotes and rules creates disincentives for providing fiber to MUP's.

Need to eliminate ambiguities that would pose barriers to deployment of fiber to multiunit premises.

- a. Preserve incentives to invest in broadband facilities.
- b. Efficient deployment cannot pick and chose customers in a mixed-use MUP, based on their respective regulatory treatments – network design and OSS problems.

Solutions:

- a. Clarify that definition of the loop is based on the specific end-user located within the MUP, rather than classifying the entire MUP as “enterprise.” This has problems as a “pick and choose” approach,

however, though it at least gives the ILEC the chance to choose to provide advanced services to such specific end-users, if it is economically efficient to do so.

- b. Other ways to clarify the definition of FTTP loops:
 - i. Consistent with broad policies expressed in *TRO*, could clarify that all FTTP is subject to relief from unbundling (with “brown field” exception).
 - ii. Alternatively, could create bright-line definition of MM FTTP loops that includes businesses likely to be included in MUPs- *i.e.* any location that uses up to 48 telephone numbers. This figure provides logistical certainty on nation-wide basis. Another approach would be to clarify that if more than a majority of the end-users in an MUP are residents, then all FTTP loops to the MUP are classified as “mass market.”